

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

NEW TECHNOLOGY ADVANTAGE,  
KEVIN DONAHOE-CEO,

Plaintiff,

v.

STEVE PETRUZELLI, WILLAMETTE  
DENTAL GROUP, PC, ET AL.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. C07-5240RBL

ORDER DENYING  
MOTIONS TO  
RECONSIDER

Pending before the court are numerous motions filed by Plaintiff following the dismissal of his case, including "Proposed MOTION for Reconsideration of ORDER 92 because of GROSS JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT," Dkt. #96; "Proposed MOTION for Reconsideration of MOTION 87 since it was NEVER PROPERLY heard with DUE DILIGENCE, wisdom, and honesty the 1st time," Dkt. #97; "Proposed MOTION for Reconsideration on LEIGHTONS [sic] FEEBLE attempt to DENY FREE SPEECH," Dkt. #100; "Proposed MOTION for Default Judgment using HUMAN RIGHTS and SENSIBLE LOGIC," Dkt. #101; "Proposed MOTION for Default Judgment using NO HUMAN RIGHTS and 'PIG LOGIC' from the NON-INTELLIGENT Judge Ronald Leighton," Dkt. #102; "Proposed MOTION for Reconsideration change of judges / location because of GROSS Judicial Employee MISCONDUCT," Dkt. #106; "Agreed DECLARATION of Case wrap-up and judicial job performance review," Dkt. #108; and "DECLARATION of POSSIBLE NON-VALID 'Remand Order' and many, many, other documents for bad recordkeeping [sic] reasons (obviously no MARK OF SUCCESS[sic],"

1 Dkt. #108. These motions have been treated as motions to reconsider. Additionally, Dkt. #s 98, 99, and  
2 104 are pending before the court. Although Dkt. #s 98, 99, and 104 are captioned "INITIAL  
3 DISCLOSURES," their content indicates that they are also intended to be motions to reconsider. The  
4 court has considered the pleadings filed in support of the motions and the file herein.

5 Under Local Rule 7, "[m]otions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny  
6 such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or  
7 legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence." CR  
8 7(h), Local Rules W.D. Wash.

9 The court did not err in its previous rulings and will not reconsider them here. Plaintiff has  
10 shown no new facts or legal authority that could not have been brought to the court's attention earlier. In  
11 short, Plaintiff has shown nothing but that he disagrees with the court's decisions. Therefore, Plaintiff's  
12 motions for reconsideration, Dkt. #s 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, and 108 are hereby  
13 DENIED.

14 All other pending motions, Dkt. #s 95, 103, and 107, are DENIED.

15 It is so ORDERED.

16 The Clerk is directed to send uncertified copies of this Order to all counsel of record and to any  
17 party appearing *pro se* at such party's last known address.

18  
19 DATED this 24<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2007.

20  
21  
22   
23 RONALD B. LEIGHTON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28